AUG 17 2005 SERVENTE

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00x

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional)	
		47612/LTR/G319	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the	Application N	umber	Filed
United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]	10/027,700		12/20/01
on	First Named Inventor		
	Mark Skiba et al.		
Signature			
	Art Unit		Examiner
Typed or printed name	2186		Tuan V. Thai
Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request. A prior request was filed on July 7, 2005, before the new pre-appeal brief procedure was announced. Please substitute this request for the prior request. This request is being filed with a notice of appeal. The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.			
applicant/inventor. assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96) attorney or agent of record. Registration number attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34. NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.	(626	5) 795-990 Tele	or printed name 0 phone number Date

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

forms are submitted.

*Total of

ARGUMENT FOR PATENTABILITY OF REJECTED CLAIMS

All the pending claims, namely, claims 9 to 13, were rejected in the Office action mailed April 8, 2005. These claims have been twice rejected.

It is submitted that the issues on this appeal are straightforward and the Examiner's final rejection is clear error that would be reversed on appeal. Accordingly, the pending claims should be allowed now to save the time and expense of an appeal.

Independent claim 9 and dependent claims 10 to 13 stand rejected as anticipated by Uemura et al patent 5,720,026 under 35 USC 102(e). But Uemura et al does not disclose storing a copy of the updated file and storing the differences in such copy each time one of files is updated. (See attached claim 9 with highlighting.)

The conventional timing for file backup is at regular intervals independent of when the files are updated. In contrast, all the claims require that backup be executed each time a file is updated. In other words, backup is performed in real time.

In paragraph 5 of the outstanding Office action, the examiner relies upon two passages in Uemura for his rejection under 35 USC 102(e). Nothing in Uemura including the two passages the examiner relies upon states that backup occurs each time a file is updated. Further, Uemura's statements, although possibly ambiguous, are completely consistent with a timed backup at regular intervals.

The examiner seems to be arguing that Uemura's teaching of incremental backup anticipates the rejected claims. But, applicant is not relying upon incremental backup for patentability so the examiner's argument is immaterial.

From the forgoing, it is clear that the rejected claims are not anticipated by Uemura under 35 USC 102(e). Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of all the claims are requested.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

Ву

LeRoy T. Rahn Reg. No. 20,356 626/795-9900

LTR/amb LTR PAS634750.1-*-08/16/05 12:44 PM



Ample No. 10/027,700

Amdt date March 16, 2005

Reply to Office action of October 19, 2004

data located on a plurality of physical storage volumes, comprising the steps:

identifying the physical storage locations of a particular logical file of electronic data stored on a plurality of physical storage volumes;

communicating said electronic data storage locations to a computer operating system;

accessing said electronic data physically located on a plurality of storage volumes by said operating system as if the data appeared on a single volume.

9. (Previously Presented) A method for backing up data stored in files as the data is updated, the method comprising:

updating one of the files;

temporarily storing a copy of the updated file (mirroring); comparing the copy of the updated file with the file prior to updating;

storing the differences in the copy of the updated file (versioning); and

repeating the foregoing steps each time one of the files is updated.

10. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 9, additionally comprising restoring one of the files to a previous condition by:

temporarily storing a copy of the current version of the file being restored;